



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,226	08/24/2001	Michel Samson	9409/2023C	3567

29933 7590 10/02/2003

PALMER & DODGE, LLP
KATHLEEN M. WILLIAMS
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02199

EXAMINER

SEHARASEYON, JEGATHEESAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/939,226

Applicant(s)

SAMSON ET AL.

Examiner

Jegatheesan Seharaseyon

Art Unit

1647

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2003 and 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 49-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 49-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the preliminary amendment of 5/23/03 and the sequence compliance submitted 7/3/03 and 9/12/03. Claims 49-81 are pending and have been renumbered under rule 1.126.

Priority

2. Applicant is required to update the priority information to indicate the allowed application (Serial Number: 08/833,752).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 49 - 81 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3a. Claim 49 recites the limitation "said candidate compound" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

3b. Claim 50 recites the limitation "said portion thereof" in part (a). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

3c. Claim 50, 52, 66 and 68 are rejected as indefinite for reciting the term "a portion thereof" because the term "a portion thereof" is not defined in the specification.

Therefore, the metes and bounds of these claims are unclear. This is because it is

Art Unit: 1647

unclear what portion of a polypeptide is encompassed in this claim. Claims 51,53-65, 67 and 69-81 are rejected insofar as they depend on rejected claims 50, 52 and 66.

3d. Claims 52 and 68 are rejected as being vague and indefinite in the recitation of the term "signaling activity of said CCR5". It is unclear what signaling activity is contemplated.

3e. Claims 55 and 71 are rejected as being vague and indefinite in the recitation of the term "intracellular cascade". It is unclear what are the cascades present in a cell are monitored in the instant invention.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4a. Claims 50, 62, 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. *This is a written description rejection.*

The specification discloses CCR5 and CCR5 deletion mutant of SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6. This meets the written description and enablement provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, the specification does not disclose all the various portions of the CCR5 receptors. The claims as written, therefore, encompass polypeptide sequences which were not originally contemplated and fail to meet the written

Art Unit: 1647

description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification does not provide written to support the genus encompassed by the instant claims.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

With the exception of CCR5 polypeptide sequences of SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6, the skilled artisan cannot envision all the detailed chemical structure of the claimed polypeptide and nucleotide sequences, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The polypeptide itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes v. Baird*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class.

Therefore, only the CCR5 polypeptide sequences of SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6, but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed is not representative of the genus because the genus is unclear and potentially highly variant. As a result, it does not appear that the inventors were in possession of the scope of all the polypeptide sequences set forth in claims 50, 62, 66 and 68.

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Art Unit: 1647

Applicants are directed to the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999.

4b. Claims 50, 62, 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue" include, but are not limited to: (1) the breadth of the claims; (2) the nature of the invention; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the level of one of ordinary skill; (5) the level of predictability in the art; (6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (7) the existence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The instant claims read on portions of CCR5 receptor protein. However, other than polypeptide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6, the specification as filed fails to disclose any other polypeptide sequences. Applicant describes the polypeptide sequences SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6 yet contemplates various portions of CCR5. The lack of

Art Unit: 1647

description of the various portions CCR5 polypeptide in the specification does not enable one of skilled in the art make and/or use the invention.

Despite knowledge in the art for producing homologues of a given protein with nucleotide deletions, insertions or substitutions the specification fails to provide any guidance regarding the changes/modifications contemplated and yet retain the function of the protein. Furthermore, detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the disclosed protein is lacking. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship, e.g. such as various sites or regions directly involved in binding, activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites. These or other regions may also be critical determinants of antigenicity. These regions can tolerate only relatively conservative substitutions or no substitutions (see Wells, 1990; Ngo et al., 1994).

Although it is accepted that the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, predicting a protein's structure and function from mere sequence data remains an elusive task. Therefore, predicting which homologues would retain the functions of the protein is well outside the realm of routine experimentation. Thus, undue amount of experimentation would be required to generate changes/modifications contemplated and yet retain the function of the proteins claimed.

Applicants have not taught how one of skill in the art would use the full scope of nucleotide sequences encompassed by the invention of claims 50, 62, 66 and 68. The specification as filed does not sufficiently teach one of skill in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed sequences. The amount of experimentation required to

Art Unit: 1647

make and/or use the full scope of the claimed sequences would require trial and error experimentation to determine the functional sequences. Given the breadth of claims in light of the unpredictability of the art as determined by the lack of working examples and shown by the prior art of record, the level of skill of the artisan, and the lack of guidance provided in the instant specification, it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Beretta et al. (U.S. Patent NO: 6, 153,431) describe human immunodeficiency virus co-receptor variants associated with resistance to virus infection. The instant application has a earlier priority date.

6. No claims are allowable

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jegatheesan Seharaseyon whose telephone number is 703-305-1112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

JS


GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600